

Exhibit 35

3505-36

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 IN RE: JUUL LABS, :
4 INC., MARKETING, SALES : Case No.
5 PRACTICES, AND PRODUCT : 3:19-md-2913-WHO
6 LIABILITY LITIGATION :
7

8 *****
9 -HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL-

10 SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
11 HYBRID VIDEOTAPED / REALTIMED DEPOSITION
12 MINETTE E. DRUMWRIGHT, Ph.D.
13 JUNE 1, 2022

14 *****
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Reported By:

24 Pat English-Arredondo, CSR, RMR, CRR, CLR

25 JOB NO: 211783

1 and operation, but if I'm not asking
2 about that, I don't need you to -- to
3 add it on. I just want the answer to
4 my questions, if that's okay.

5 MR. HUDSON: Okay. And all
6 I'll say on the record is that I think
7 today she has been very responsive to
8 the questions that have been asked.
9 If there's one category where you're
10 unhappy about that it's fine to have
11 mentioned that, but I don't think it
12 needs to rise to the point of
13 escalating the situation. We
14 understand and she'll do her very best
15 to answer your questions.

16 Q. (By Mr. Stekloff) Okay. But
17 my question is just simple. Yes or no. Did
18 Altria -- I'm -- I'm conceding the -- the
19 point. Simple question, did Altria have the
20 legal ability to force JLI to take any of its
21 services?

22 A. It did not have the legal
23 ability.

24 Q. Okay. Thank you. Is it also
25 true that JLI chose not to take many of the